

### REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The claims are 2-23. Claim 12 has been amended to be in independent form and to better define the invention, claim 1 drawn to an alloy composition has been canceled, and claims 2-11 previously drawn to an alloy composition have been amended to be directed to an anti-friction coating dependent directly or indirectly on claim 12 as amended. In addition, claim 15 has been amended to be in independent form and claims 24-26 have been canceled. Reconsideration is expressly requested.

As stated above, Applicants elect Group II, claims 12-14, drawn to a coated article and also amended claims 2-11 which have been amended to be directed to a coated article, for further prosecution and respectfully traverse the requirement for restriction for the following reasons.

As an initial matter, it is respectfully submitted that method claims 15-23 should be considered along with the elected Group II claims directed to a coated article as method claim 15 has been amended to be in independent form and is directed to a

method of producing a composite material including at least a first peripheral coating and a second peripheral coating dispersed on top of it wherein an alloy as specified in claim 12 as amended is produced as a first peripheral coating by means of a cold gas spraying process. It is believed that the method claims 15-23 are sufficiently related to the anti-friction coating claims of elected Group II as to warrant their consideration by the Examiner in this patent application.

In any event, it is believed that any search for the invention embodied in Group II would necessarily include a search for the inventions embodied in the remaining Groups I, III and IV. Thus, the simultaneous search for all groups is believed not to constitute an unreasonable search for the Patent Examiner.

In addition, it is believed that the objectives of streamlined examination and compact prosecution would be promoted if a search were conducted simultaneously for all groups. Also, the necessity of filing multiple patent applications in this case does not serve to promote the public interest because of the extra expense that is involved, in filing fees and examination

costs, as well as the burden upon the public, due to the necessity of searching through a multiplicity of patent files in order to find the complete range of the subject matter claimed in several different patents that could otherwise be found in one issued patent only.


Applicants reserve the right to file divisional applications for the non-elected species.

In summary, claims 1 and 24-26 have been canceled and claims 2-12 and 15 have been amended. For all these reasons, it is respectfully requested that the restriction requirement under 35 U.S.C. 121 be withdrawn and that an action on the merits of all the claims be rendered.

Applicants also submit herewith a Second Supplemental  
Information Disclosure Statement.

Respectfully submitted,  
Hubert LANG ET AL

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.  
1077 Northern Boulevard  
Roslyn, New York 11576  
(516) 365-9802




Frederick J. Dorchak, Reg.No.29,298  
Edward R. Freedman, Reg.No.26,048  
Attorneys for Applicants

FJD:cmm

Enclosures: Second Supplemental Information Disclosure Statement  
with Form PTO-1449 and three (3) references, German Office Action  
dated June 26, 2006 with English translation of relevant parts

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited  
with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope  
addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on July 7, 2009.



Amy Klein